

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed September 3, 2004 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-19 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter of the claims. In particular, the wordy limitations have been revised or removed. Claims 20-22 have been added. The new claims are supported at page 3, lines 10-13; at page 8, line 14- page 9, line 4; and at Figures 2 and 3. No new subject matter has been added. Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

### **Objections**

The disclosure at page 3, line 27 was objected to for including a typographical error. In response, the specification has been amended to correct the error.

Claims 2 and 14 were objected to for including a typographical error regarding a reference numeral. In response, claims 2 and 14 have been amended to correct the error.

### **Anticipation Rejections**

Claims 1-2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson (US 4,846,141). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 recites a bow sight for use with a bow that includes, among other things, a pivot portion pivotally connectable to the bow including a first pin adjustment mechanism for moving the pin sight point vertically, and a second adjustment mechanism for allowing the pin to move in a direction towards or away from a target. Johnson fails to disclose or suggest a bow sight having the above features.

In particular, Johnson fails to disclose a bow sight that includes an adjustment mechanism for allowing the pin to move in a direction towards or away from a target. Johnson merely discloses a bow sight wherein the pins can be adjusted in a direction perpendicular to the direction towards and away from the target (i.e., up, down, left, and right). See Johnson at Figure 2. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated. Claim 2 depends on and further limits claim 1; therefore, it is not anticipated for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8 is directed at a bow sight for attachment to a bow that also includes a pin adjustment mechanism for allowing the pin to move in a direction towards or away from a target. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, claim 8 is also not anticipated.

### **Obviousness Rejections**

Claims 3-7 and 9-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Winegar (US 5,685,081).

The above-identified claims related to either an apparatus where the pin can move in a direction towards or away from the target or a method wherein the pin is moved in a direction towards or away from the target. As discussed above, Johnson fails to disclose or suggest an apparatus that relates to such an apparatus or method. Winegar fails to cure the defect of Johnson because Winegar also fails to disclose or suggest either an apparatus wherein the pin can move in a direction towards or away from the target or a method wherein the pin is moved in a direction towards or away from the target. In particular, Winegar at Figure 1 shows sight faces that can be moved up/down and left/right, but not towards or away from the target. Accordingly, the pending claims are not obvious.

### **New Claims**

New claim 20 is directed at a method of sighting comprising, among other steps, the step of sighting the bow for an angled shot by sliding the sight point in a direction towards or away from the target. As discussed above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest a method of sighting where the pins are moved towards or away from the target, therefore claim 20 is allowable. Claims 21 and 22 incorporate the feature of claim 16 relating to the pin being movable in a direction towards or away from the target. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, claim 21 and 22 are also allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (claims 1-22) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at 612-336-4617 if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.

Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there are many other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

(612) 332-5300

Date: December 9, 2004



  
David G. Schmaltz

Reg. No. 39,828

DGS/JEL:sl